



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/822,495	04/12/2004	Christopher Ronnewinkel	13906-168001 / 2004P00095	3024
32864 7590 01/11/2007 FISH & RICHARDSON, P.C. PO BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			EXAMINER HWANG, JOON H	
			ART UNIT 2166	PAPER NUMBER
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE			MAIL DATE	
3 MONTHS			01/11/2007	
			DELIVERY MODE PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/822,495

Applicant(s)

RONNEWINKEL ET AL.

Examiner

Joon H. Hwang

Art Unit

2166

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 December 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4/12/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The claims 1-23 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-6, 11, 13-15 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

"may be" in 6th line of claim 1, 2nd line of claim 2, 3rd line of claim 3, 2nd line of claim 4, 2nd line of claim 5, 2nd line of claim 6, 2nd line of claim 11, 2nd line of claim 14, 3rd line of claim 15, and 6th and 21st line of claim 23 renders the claims indefinite.

"can be" in 2nd line of claim 13 renders the claim indefinite.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

5. Claims 1-20 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

"A computer program product tangibly embodied in an information carrier" in 1st line of claim 1 is insufficient to render the claim fallen within a statutory category since

"an information carrier" is not clearly limited to physical articles or objects, such as a storage device disclosed on pages 39-40 of the specification. Thus, claim 1 is non-statutory. Claims 2-19 are likewise rejected.

"A software program tangibly embodied in an information carrier" in 16th line of claim 20 is insufficient to render the claim fallen within a statutory category since "an information carrier" is not clearly limited to physical articles or objects, such as a storage device disclosed on pages 39-40 of the specification. Thus, claim 20 is non-statutory.

"A computer program product tangibly embodied in an information carrier" in 1st line of claim 23 is insufficient to render the claim fallen within a statutory category since "an information carrier" is not clearly limited to physical articles or objects, such as a storage device disclosed on pages 39-40 of the specification. Thus, claim 23 is non-statutory.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 1-4, 7, 10, and 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Snow et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,055,540).

With respect to claim 1, Snow teaches a categorization area that displays user-input fields which may be used to define a plurality of categories and a plurality of links

Art Unit: 2166

that form a categorization scheme (i.e., displaying category hierarchy, item 22 in fig. 2, and a user by inputting defines categories and links, lines 12-39 in col. 3), each category corresponding to certain content associated with that category (i.e., category for documents, lines 5-7 in col. 3), each category being defined to be at one of a series of levels between a top level and a bottom level, wherein each category at a level below the top level is linked by one of the plurality of defined links as a child category to a corresponding parent category, the parent category being one of the categories defined in the level immediately above the child category, wherein each child category corresponds to certain content that is a sub-set of the content that corresponds to the corresponding parent category (i.e., class hierarchy including categories and sub-categories in levels, line 58 in col. 2 thru line 39 in col. 3 and fig. 1), and the categorization scheme is organized to enable the computer-executed process to categorize the data, the categorization causing categories that correspond to the data to be selected, the selection being made by making a category determination beginning at the top level and proceeding to the children of categories that correspond to the data (i.e., classification and retrieval of documents, lines 31-38 in col. 2).

With respect to claim 2, Snow teaches a linking area that displays user-input fields which may be used to define associations between categories defined in the categorization area and stored information, such that the computer-executed process, when executed, uses the stored information that is linked to the selected categories to perform subsequent processing of the data (lines 12-39 in col. 3).

With respect to claim 3, Snow teaches the linking area further displays a plurality of user-selectable links, each link corresponding to a viewset that displays user-input fields which may be used to define associations between categories defined in the categorization area and stored information (lines 12-67 in col. 3).

With respect to claim 4, Snow teaches one of the user-selectable links corresponds to a viewset that displays user-input fields which may be used to define associations between categories defined in the categorization area and documents (lines 12-67 in col. 3 and lines 31-38 in col. 2).

With respect to claim 7, Snow teaches one of the user-selectable links corresponds to a viewset that displays a query input area for entering criteria that defines the content that corresponds to each category (lines 1-11 in col. 3).

With respect to claim 10, Snow teaches the stored information is stored in a plurality of memory locations in an enterprise computing system (i.e., items 136, 138 in fig. 9).

With respect to claims 17-18, Snow teaches the data comprises business objects including stored documents (lines 31-38 in col. 2).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 5-6, 11-13, 16, 19, 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Snow et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,055,540) in view of Gainey et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,941,304).

With respect to claim 5, Snow discloses the claimed subject matter as discussed above except associations between categories and experts. However, Gainey teaches one of the user-selectable links corresponds to a viewset that displays user-input fields which may be used to define associations between categories defined in the categorization area and experts (i.e., redirect recipients, lines 18-65 in col. 7 and lines 14-17 in col. 8) in order to quickly and efficiently handle incoming email message having query (lines 40-53 in col. 1). Therefore, based on Snow in view of Gainey, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teaching of Gainey to the system of Snow in order to quickly and efficiently handle incoming email message having query.

With respect to claim 6, Snow discloses the claimed subject matter as discussed above except association between categories and response templates. However, Gainey teaches one of the user-selectable links corresponds to a viewset that displays user-input fields which may be used to define associations between categories defined in the categorization area and response templates (i.e., template, lines 18-65 in col. 7) in order to quickly and efficiently handle incoming email message having query (lines 40-53 in col. 1). Therefore, based on Snow in view of Gainey, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

utilize the teaching of Gainey to the system of Snow in order to quickly and efficiently handle incoming email message having query.

With respect to claim 11, Snow discloses the claimed subject matter as discussed above except association between categorization schemes and pre-defined business processes. However, Gainey teaches the linking area further displays an application area which may be used to define associations between categorization schemes that have been defined in the categorization area and pre-defined business processes that categorize the data (i.e., actions, lines 18-65 in col. 7) in order to quickly and efficiently handle incoming email message having query (lines 40-53 in col. 1). Therefore, based on Snow in view of Gainey, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teaching of Gainey to the system of Snow in order to quickly and efficiently handle incoming email message having query.

With respect to claim 12, Gainey further teaches the linking area is used to associate a plurality of business processes with a categorization scheme (i.e., actions, lines 18-65 in col. 7). Therefore, the limitations of claim 12 are rejected in the analysis of claim 11 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

With respect to claim 13, Gainey further teaches at least two of the plurality of associated business processes can be executed using stored information determined to be linked to categories selected during a single categorization of the data (i.e., actions, lines 18-65 in col. 7). Therefore, the limitations of claim 13 are rejected in the analysis of claim 12 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

With respect to claim 16, Snow discloses the claimed subject matter as discussed above except the data comprising content of a received message. However, Gainey teaches the data comprising content of a received message (i.e., categorizing email messages, lines 55-63 in col. 6) in order to quickly and efficiently handle incoming email message having query (lines 40-53 in col. 1). Therefore, based on Snow in view of Gainey, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teaching of Gainey to the system of Snow in order to quickly and efficiently handle incoming email message having query.

With respect to claim 19, Snow discloses the claimed subject matter as discussed above except the business objects including stored response templates. However, Gainey teaches the business objects including stored response templates (i.e., template, lines 18-65 in col. 7) in order to quickly and efficiently handle incoming email message having query (lines 40-53 in col. 1). Therefore, based on Snow in view of Gainey, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teaching of Gainey to the system of Snow in order to quickly and efficiently handle incoming email message having query.

With respect to claim 21, Snow teaches inputting categorization scheme information into user-input fields displayed in a categorization area of a graphical user interface (GUI), the categorization scheme information including a plurality of categories and a plurality of links (i.e., displaying category hierarchy, item 22 in fig. 2, and a user by inputting defines categories and links, lines 12-39 in col. 3), each category corresponding to certain content associated with that category (i.e., category for

documents, lines 5-7 in col. 3), each category being defined to be at one of a series of levels between a top level and a bottom level, wherein each category at a level below the top level is linked by one of the plurality of defined links as a child category to a corresponding parent category, the parent category being one of the categories defined in the level immediately above the child category, wherein each child category corresponds to certain content that is a sub-set of the content that corresponds to the corresponding parent category (i.e., class hierarchy including categories and sub-categories in levels, line 58 in col. 2 thru line 39 in col. 3 and fig. 1), and the categorization scheme is organized to enable the computer-executed process to categorize documents, the categorization causing categories that correspond to the documents to be selected, the selection being made by making a category determination beginning at the top level and proceeding to the children of categories that correspond to the documents (i.e., classification and retrieval of documents, lines 31-38 in col. 2). Snow does not explicitly disclose categorizing content of a received message. However, Gainey teaches categorizing the content of a received message (i.e., categorizing email messages, lines 55-63 in col. 6) in order to quickly and efficiently handle incoming email message having query (lines 40-53 in col. 1). Therefore, based on Snow in view of Gainey, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teaching of Gainey to the system of Snow in order to quickly and efficiently handle incoming email message having query.

With respect to claim 22, Snow teaches defining links using a linking area displayed in the GUI, the links defining associations between categories defined in the categorization area and stored information, such that the computer-executed process, when executed, uses the stored information that is linked to the selected categories to perform subsequent processing of the data (lines 12-39 in col. 3).

The limitations of claims 20 and 23 are rejected in the analysis of claims 21-22 above, and these claims are rejected on that basis.

10. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Snow et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,055,540) in view of Pak et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0260534).

With respect to claim 8, Snow discloses the claimed subject matter as discussed above except a preview for viewing selected stored information. However, Pak teaches one of the user-selectable links corresponds to a viewset that displays a preview area for viewing selected stored information (i.e., preview of solutions, section 37 on page 3) in order to verify if the selected stored information is the best result. Therefore, based on Snow in view of Pak, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teaching of Pak to the system of Snow in order to verify if the selected stored information is the best result.

11. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Snow et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,055,540) in view of Huynh et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0198909).

With respect to claim 9, Snow discloses the claimed subject matter as discussed above except cut and paste functionality. However, Huynh teaches the GUI displays in the categorization area user-selectable buttons that, when selected, enable information in the user-input fields to be edited using cut and paste functionality (sections 125-126 on page 9) in order to provide a convenient way of duplicating data to a user. Therefore, based on Snow in view of Huynh, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teaching of Huynh to the system of Snow in order to provide a convenient way of duplicating data to a user.

12. Claims 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Snow et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,055,540) in view of Shakib et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,752,025).

With respect to claim 14, Snow discloses the claimed subject matter as discussed above except selectable buttons. However, Shakib teaches the categorization area further displays selectable buttons which may be used to change the level at which a category is defined (line 48 in col. 1 thru line 12 in col. 2 and fig. 3) in order to provide a customizable view to a user. Therefore, based on Snow in view of Shakib, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to utilize the teaching of Shakib to the system of Snow in order to provide a customizable view to a user.

With respect to claim 15, Snow discloses the claimed subject matter as discussed above except selectable buttons. However, Shakib teaches the categorization area further displays selectable buttons associated with each parent category, wherein each parent category may be selectively displayed in an expanded form in which all child categories are graphically displayed, and selectively displayed in a collapsed form such that no child categories are graphically displayed (line 48 in col. 1 thru line 12 in col. 2 and fig. 3) in order to provide a customizable view to a user. Therefore, based on Snow in view of Shakib, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teaching of Shakib to the system of Snow in order to provide a customizable view to a user.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joon H. Hwang whose telephone number is 571-272-4036. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6:00(M~F).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain T. Alam can be reached on 571-272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2166

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Joon Hwang
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2100

1/4/07